

**From:** eric j [mailto:fishinmishin@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 03, 2008 7:22 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Mpa plan 2XA

Hello,my name is Eric Just and I'm a recreational fisherman in strong favor of MLP plan 2XA.My son and I have enjoyed fishing for salmon along our coast and look forward to it every year,he is only 11 years old and would have a hard time understanding if it all disappeared.He and I love to fish in the ocean in our 19 foot trophy and would be unsafe in most circumstances to venture offshore to find the salmon.My family and I are in strong favor of plan 2XA.

Thank you,  
Eric Just and family

---

**From:** Jon Dunn [mailto:dunndeals@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 03, 2008 4:36 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Option 2 XA

Dear BRTF Members,

I'm writing to request that you vote in favor of option 2 XA. I believe it achieves the desired goals of the MLPA while providing recreation opportunities for all Californians. To implement any other option would cause a huge upset in the lives of many people who depend on sustainable fisheries, ranging from marinas, boat repair shops, bait shops, motel operators etc. The list is extensive.

Thank you,

Albert Dunn

---

**From:** Allen E [mailto:hemiallen@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 03, 2008 9:29 AM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Proposal vote

Good morning.

I write to you to ask that you select proposal 2-xa, which is supported by Coastside fishing club, and I hope all fishing people. The proposal is the best compromise for sustaining the right to fish, and the resources, which most if not all fishermen strive to accomplish, another day to partake in the great sport of fishing.

I realize that there is a huge undertaking going on in the ranks of the people who feel ALL fishing should be illegal , but these ridiculous stands do nothing to the future of the fisheries. Our money spent on fishing licenses, sporting goods needed for the sport, and all other associated

revenues generated by fishermen are what pays the bills to keep the fishery the way it is, and mother nature does the rest.

If this truly is a democratic process with sound fish data used to compliment the MLPA process, I am sure you will select 2-XA as the best choice.

Thank you for listening

Allen Elsholz, Terri, Michael, Michelle, and their spouses kAYLA and Shaun. We all enjoy fishing the ocean, and will benefit from your decision.

---

**From:** GrizzlyElec@cs.com [mailto:GrizzlyElec@cs.com]

**Sent:** Thursday, April 03, 2008 4:44 PM

**To:** MLPAComments

**Subject:** I want to fish our ocean

I am a Coastside member and love to fish salt water for Salmon, Rock Fish and Halibut out of Pillar Point Harbor. My grandkids and I fish 3 to 4 days a week. We cannot believe what MLPA is trying to do on the California Coast. MLPA is putting all the blame on the sport fishing community by saying its over fished. When in fact if they wouldn't have shut down most of the hatcheries we would not have a shortage of Salmon for sports or commercial fishing. The only fair and reasonable thing to do now is to go with 2-XA. If you do not make this decision it will devastate the fishing industry and all the businesses that depend on it in California.

Barry Temple  
Grizzly Electric

---

From: Superfish [mailto:[wxdoo@pacbell.net](mailto:wxdoo@pacbell.net)]

Sent: Thursday, April 03, 2008 10:16 AM

To: MLPAComments

Subject: mlpa

Members of the MLPA Committees:

My name is Bill Doo. I am a sport fisherman and a fisheries biologist (Humboldt State University, BS Fisheries '68) who has been fishing for recreation since the 1950s. I have fished from the piers in San Francisco to the deep blue ocean at the Farallon Islands. I have seen many San Francisco Bay and coastal fishing accesses closed off for various reasons.

Closing an appropriate amount of area for fish and other sea life conservation is great but please do not go overboard by make the MLPA a large aquarium that many of the general public will not be able to see and enjoy for what it is.

I contribute to the economy by spending a great deal of my money towards my fishing hobby. How much money does a bowler, tennis player, or any sport spectator contribute directly to help the fauna of our state?

Since I am very near retirement as many other baby boomers, I rather spend my money and live my remaining life on something that I really enjoy than go on any worldly sight seeing trips.

Let me fish and I will show you the money. Please support proposal 2-XA. Deal or no deal?

---

**From:** McIntyre, Charles [mailto:Charles.McIntyre@ejgallo.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 03, 2008 9:54 AM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Support Proposal X-2A

To whom it may Concern:

My name is Charles K. McIntyre; my family has lived in the great state of California since the time gold was discovered. Our family has used the resources that this fine state has to offer, it started out panning for gold during California's gold rush, then we were timber fallers, and we have always hunted and fished. Now once again the politicians of this state are trying real hard to restrict my family's way of life one more time. My grand kids will only be able to here the stories about fishing our great ocean, and they will not have the pleasure of doing so them self's, My family has always believed in conservation and I'm a proud parent who has taught my kids to be conservationist, the only proposal that will work for everybody is X-2A.

If X-2A is not approved, then there is no way we can go fishing out of Bodega Bay any more, and once again we have lost more of our heritage and traditions.

Respectively,  
Charles K. McIntyre III  
Waterford, CA

---

**From:** Charles Lung [mailto:fishleboat@sbcglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 03, 2008 2:01 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** suggestions for new fishing regs

Please consider Coastside Fishing club and the 2-XA for our new MLPA in northern Calif.

Chuck Lung

---

**From:** Chris Leuterio [<mailto:leuterio@mac.com>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 03, 2008 5:22 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** MPLA 2-XA support

I am writing in support of proposal 2-XA. As a Marin County native and life long fisherman, I am very concerned about the future of our fishery. I believe that any regulations that would limit our rights to fish should be based on sound science and should not be over broad.

Please understand that these restrictions have very severe consequences on all the recreational fisherman who contribute so much to the economy of California. I trust this decision will take into account the interests of our fishing citizenry and allow fair and open access to our waters.

Thank you,

Chris Leuterio  
Mill Valley, CA

---

**From:** mojito dog [mailto:mojito2001@sbcglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 03, 2008 6:20 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** support for 2X-A

Dear MLPA members,

I vote every election and I support candidates who support my hobbies. I support proposal 2X-A. My name is Christopher Hesson, I am a sports fisherman, scuba, and free diver, and fish the waters outside the Golden Gate Bridge for salmon, rock cod, ling cod, dungeness crab, stripe bass halibut and abalone to feed my family and friends. I have fished these waters for many years and am familiar with the spikes and dips in fish populations. Most have natural causes like El Nino, many have land based causes like fertilizer pollution from farms and sewage releases, and occasionally they are caused by overfishing. Through strict take limits of the DFG overfishing by recreational has been eliminated. Any closures should be kept to a minimum.

Thank You  
Christopher Hesson  
sausalito ca

---

**From:** Daryl Omar [mailto:daryl@mossrubber.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 03, 2008 8:48 AM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** kids for fishing

Dear Task Force Members,

I strongly urge you to support Proposal 2-XA in your upcoming vote. I have been a recreational fisherman for more than 30 years and based on that experience, I believe that Proposal 2\_XA is the 'least-worst' alternative to address a difficult situation. It is the most balanced option which addresses both conservation requirements and socioeconomic impacts on commercial and recreational fishermen.

Of all the proposals offered, 2-XA achieves the most of the MLPA scientific and conservation goals and the DFG guidelines. Further it is the most enforceable and I

believe will be the most likely to gain the support of the various communities/groups involved.

thanks  
daryl omar

---

From: DOUG kuhl [<mailto:doug63@sbcglobal.net>]  
Sent: Thursday, April 03, 2008 9:16 AM  
To: MLPAComments  
Subject: WE ARE WORRIED!!!!

Our Grand Father Doug Kuhl has told us that we may never be able to fish with him for Salmon again in the ocean because it will be too dangerous and he will have to go too far. We asked if we could write a letter and ask you to vote for 2-XA

Thank you Kiersten, Kyle and Lauren

---

**From:** Erik Kjaer [<mailto:bodegaerik@sbcglobal.net>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 03, 2008 7:34 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** MLPA

To whom it may concern,

As an avid recreational sportfisherman and avid abalone diver, I strongly support MLPA Proposal 2-XA.

Erik Kjaer

---

**From:** Geza Paulovits [<mailto:gp@efainc.com>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 03, 2008 1:14 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Cc:** Mike Chrisman  
**Subject:** Proposal 2-XA

Dear Blue Ribbon Task Force,

I'm writing this letter to voice my support for all your efforts and to urge you to vote for Proposal 2-XA.

I was born and raised in California and intend to raise my family here as well. As an avid outdoorsman, I have always been an environmentalist. Spending much time in the outdoors throughout my life has fostered within me a deep appreciation of our great State. Experiencing the natural beauty of our State from the Coast to the

Sierras and everything in between is a gift and a privilege to anyone who lives in and visits California. Enjoying outdoor activities such as fishing near Half Moon Bay and North outside the Golden Gate allows citizens such as myself to spend time caring for and appreciating this great place we call home. Through prudent management, the Dept. of Fish and Game has done a good job protecting our State's wildlife so it is here for future generations to appreciate. Like many others, I spend a vast majority of my recreational dollars on outdoor activities such as fishing off our coast. Only 8 weeks old, my son is still too young for an outing on the boat. In a few years, I hope to take him for his first time under the Golden Gate at sunrise and up our scenic coast. Experiences like this are found nowhere else in the world and are part of what make California so special.

After reading the various proposals, I urge you to support Proposal 2-XA. Rules established by Proposal 2-XA will protect our Marine Life, are enforceable, and have several other benefits superior to the other proposals. Proposal 2-XA allows citizens such as myself a chance to continue enjoying the natural wonders of our great state, with the added economic benefit to local businesses and tax and licensing revenues to the state.

Thank you for all your hard work thus far on this very challenging issue.

For our children and future generations of Californians, please support Proposal 2-XA.

Respectfully,

Geza Paulovits  
Californian

---

**From:** Guy Gilchrist [mailto:[guygilchrist@earthlink.net](mailto:guygilchrist@earthlink.net)]

**Sent:** Thursday, April 03, 2008 9:24 AM

**To:** MLPAComments

**Subject:** Proposition 2-XA

I Strongly urge you to vote for proposition 2-XA!

It is seen by myself and many others as the only viable option in an otherwise sad situation.

As a long time resident in the State of California and recreational angler, I see proposition 2-XA as the ONLY one that best satisfies the safe and educational use of the California State Ocean waters!

From a selfish viewpoint, I want to continue the enjoyment of a nice day on the water taking my children and grandchildren ocean fishing, as my Grandfather did with my Dad & me.

Just the negative economic impact of the other 2 options in an already down turned economy would be further crippling.

In closing, vote for 2-XA  
Thanks you

Guy Gilchrist  
Redwood City, CA

---

**From:** Hans Reisel [mailto:desertdawg@charter.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 03, 2008 7:56 AM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Urgent, We Need More Smiling Children - Support 2-XA

Our society has become so hypocritical, largely in part of our entertainment industry and government.

The entertainment industry feeds our kids non stop violence, and government - well what can you say - "is out of touch with reality"???

With obese kids, violence in schools, low self esteem everywhere. No one has answer, besides "what is wrong". Come on, the answers are right before you???

Over the years I have written lots of long-winded letters, I'll keep this short.

The truth of the matter is:

Fishing = happy kids and in turn better adults.

They are outdoors, with family and friend, and believe it or not they learn to respect nature.

My son and daughter and fish since they were old enough to hold fishing poles. Guess what my 23 year old son did last week (March 26)????

We were walking out of a Dairy Queen in Port Alberni, BC, and my son noticed a big fat night crawler (worm) on the ground right behind the tire. To my surprise he pick it up and moved it into the platter box.

When I asked why he did that, his reply was, heck some day that may catch a big fish. LOL

So when you have to vote and make a decision that will impact my grandkids, remember this:

What do all fishing pictures have in common????? Big big smiles.

Kind regards

Hans Reisel  
Reno, Nevada

---

**From:** HSillin@aol.com [mailto:HSillin@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 03, 2008 10:40 AM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Support for MPLA

I have reviewed the MPLA proposals and I support 2-XA. It is a balanced proposal that meets MPLA goals and best supports fisherman's usage. I am a long term ocean fishermen and boat owner and being the the water enjoying my sport means a great deal to me. I also believe in protecting our resourses for the long term. I appreciate your consideration for proposal 2-XA

Sincerely,  
Harry Sillin

---

From: hdpetereit@dslextreme.com [<mailto:hdpetereit@dslextreme.com>]  
Sent: Thursday, April 03, 2008 1:02 PM  
To: MLPAComments  
Cc: Mike Chrisman  
Subject: MLPA COMMENTS

To whom it may concern:

I have been fishing this ocean for over 50 years, and I have seen good years and bad years. But even in the bad years, I was still lucky enough to be able and spend time on the ocean and enjoy the beauty of the ocean. Now, with this MLPA, I am seeing areas where I have fished being threatened with closure when, in my opinion, the fishing has been the best in years. I understand that the MLPA is not all about the fish, but also the entire eco-system. This makes sense and it is a good thing. We need to protect the wonderful bounty that our ocean provides. But what does not make sense is the level in which some of the proposals want to shut off access to the ocean. I think that this would do more harm than good. Will my son and his boys continue to enjoy the ocean if all of the good fishing spots are marked "off limits.?" I don't think so. I think that after a while, they will not care about the ocean any more. And that would be far more destructive than allowing a few more reefs to remain open for fishing.

The way I understand it, proposal 2-XA meets all of the goals and requirements of the MLPA and department of fish and game, provides a solid network of marine reserves for future generations, still allows reasonable and safe access to the ocean for the small boater, and is supported by many fishermen and conservationists. Why go any further? More is not necessarilly better.

Please support proposal 2-XA.



Thank you,

Helmut Petereit  
Auburn, CA

M

---

From: Ivan Lum [<mailto:ilum@juniper.net>]  
Sent: Thursday, April 03, 2008 4:09 PM  
To: MLPAComments  
Subject: In support of Proposal 2-XA

Dear MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force,

I have reviewed the latest MLPA proposals and I want to put my support 100% behind Proposal 2-XA. And I urge for you to do the same.

Proposal 2-XA is the most balanced in terms of meeting the goals of the MLPA and the sportfishing /boating community.

Thanks You,

Ivan Lum

---

**From:** Jackie Daniels [<mailto:jackiedaniels@comcast.net>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 03, 2008 5:21 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** MLPA Initiative

Hello,My name is Jackie Daniels,I'm a lifelong Californian and proud of it.My husband and I love the outdoors,and enjoy the ocean just about as much as anything in our lives.I'm very concerned with conservation,and all it entails.I'm a lot saddened by the declines in our fish lately,and it seems that we have to get control of that.We need changes for sure,but shutting down the hook and line fishing people just does not seem to be the right solution.We need to look at water diversion harder,put more salmon smolts back into the ocean,and rely on scientific data to tell us what to do.I'm a STRONG supporter of 2-XA and I hope that you will help the fishing public out and be one also.

Thanks,  
Jackie Daniels

---

**From:** James Hicks [<mailto:wellingtoninspection@yahoo.com>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 03, 2008 2:41 AM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** In support of Proposal 2-XA

After carefully reviewing the maps of the proposed MPA's, I am shocked that a plan such as Proposal 4 would even be considered. Proposal 4 eliminates most inshore fishing areas which are accessible by small boats. Fishing with my kids has always been an important pastime for our family. It is the time we spend fishing that we find out what is going on in their young lives. As fishers, my kids and I care about the ocean enviroment and consider

ourselves stewards of the ocean. We understand the need for the MPA's will continue to fish in the allowable areas. An adoption of Proposal 4 would mean putting my children in danger by requiring us to travel farther to get to the fishing grounds. If this was necessary, I would understand. But this is not necessary. Proposal 2-XA creates the MPA's required, while leaving the close, inshore fishing areas safely accessible to the small boat fisherman. It would appear that any proposal other than 2-XA would be irresponsible, putting fishers and their families unnecessarily in harms way. As you know, ocean conditions could change in the blink of an eye, and like all fisherman, I don't want to unnecessarily have to risk my life and the lives of my family struggling a long distance back to port. Please consider Proposal 2-XA as it creates the needed MPA's and protects the lives of the recreational fishers and the precious cargo they may have on board. Thank You for your time. James Hicks

James Hicks  
Burlingame, CA.

---

**From:** Jim N/A [mailto:helicon01@pacbell.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 03, 2008 3:45 PM  
**To:** Mike Chrisman; MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Intentions of the MLPA Process and support for 2-XA

Secretary Chrisman,  
MLPA Blue ribbon Task Force members,

On reading the start of the MLPA process it appears that many Californians are not aware of the implications, especially when environmental extremists bring their clout and finances into the process. There has been little to non-existent information in the media. If the public understood what is transpiring they would agree that the process wasn't open to all perspectives.

As a fisherman and conservationist I can see protecting sensitive areas in the ocean! Where my view differs is that I don't believe in closing off huge areas. The poll that was performed shows that the public doesn't blame the fishing community. One of the public's main concerns was pollution. Population growth was another.

My view of the future if either proposal 4 or 13 are chosen is that the process will continue to do the same thing. The Central coast was the first zone implemented and I see the same mentality in this process. I firmly don't believe in a government that is using private money funded by an environmental group in such a process as this. Even though the MLPA process is suppose to be open and transparent, it seems that the financing is and does have a strong influence on the overall outcome.

The Central zone closures affected many businesses and will continue to do so. The North Central coast zone has even more business that can/will lose money. It isn't just the fishing community that is already hurting. It covers an area off the coast where there is a

large population and the trickle down affect from lost revenue will be felt all the way to the state level in lost tax revenue.

I urge everyone to seriously consider the overall outcome and don't use the "I did this just because it looks good". Consider the communities, users and think about the peoples intent before rushing to a decision.

I don't like watching the affects of poor implementation that doesn't meet the original intent for implementation. I have no choice other than support Proposal 2-XA, I have physically seen that fishing changes are working. Fish quantities and size have increased in the last few years.

In closing, Make the right choice and Pass proposal 2-XA forward for the California Fish and Game Commission decision.

Thank You,  
James Volberding

---

**From:** Jim N/A [mailto:helicon01@pacbell.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 03, 2008 7:40 AM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Cc:** Mike Chrisman  
**Subject:** Support for Proposal 2-XA

Dear BRTF members,

Please adopt the best proposal which is 2-XA to preserve the major fishing areas off the North Central coast. It is the most balanced proposal and meets all the requirements.

Thank You,  
James Volberding

---

**From:** Jim Volberding [mailto:jamiv925@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 03, 2008 10:39 AM  
**To:** MLPAComments; Mike Chrisman  
**Subject:** Support for Proposal 2-XA

Dear MLPA BRTF Members,

I started fishing about 15 year ago. I have fished for salmon, Rockfish and Halibut at the Islands and many places along the coast, including Pt. Reyes and Duxbury reef. I believe that the MLPA process should be fair to everyone and that is why I fully support proposal 2-XA. The extremists believe in taking away the better fishing areas along our coast. They don't care about

safety or the economic impact that it will have. Proposal 2-XA is a well thought out and balanced proposal that meets all guidelines of both the MLPA and for DFG feasibility.

Please consider all Californians' futures and apply science as it should be used. Theories are just that! Proven facts and the overall consequences of now and the future are what need to be considered carefully. I watched the Central coast MLPA process and was ashamed of the results. This is the BRTF's and DFG's chance to show that decisions are not biased against the fishing community. Please accept proposal 2-XA, the fair and balanced proposal instead of the environmental version which closes vast areas near the coast.

Thank You,  
Jeremy Volberding

---

From: J. Hendricks [<mailto:jjhend@astound.net>]  
Sent: Thursday, April 03, 2008 7:48 PM  
To: MLPAComments  
Subject: Support Proposal 2-XA

Dear BRTF,

As a California fisherman and certified scuba diver I support proposal 2-XA.

This proposal has the least economic impact and achieves all conservation & scientific goals of the MLPA. Do the right thing and back proposal 2-XA

Joe Hendricks  
Concord, Ca

---

**From:** Jonathan Dunn [<mailto:dunndeals@hotmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 03, 2008 8:08 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** MLPA SAT "no marked difference...."

Dears Sir/ Madam,

I've been informed that the Science Advisory Team has determined that there is "no marked difference between the proposals". I believe that is all that's necessary for you to adopt option 2XA. Any other option will cause extreme economic hardship to businesses up and down the state and severley limit the recreation opportunities for tens of thousands of conservation minded California anglers.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jon & Sharon Dunn  
Oakland CA

---

**From:** Julie Logue-Riordan [mailto:logueriordan@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 03, 2008 10:04 AM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Support for 2/XA in total no amendments

Please pass the 2/XA proposal in its entirety as it stands in its present form dated 3-19-08, with no amendments.

Julie Logue-Riordan

---

**From:** Terry Fujii [mailto:tkfuj@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 03, 2008 4:58 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Support Option 2-XA

I am a certified SCUBA diver and enjoy freediving for abalone along the northern California coast. Option 2-XA offers the most access for shore based diving for abalone, Option 4 the least. Please select Option 2-XA.

Respectfully

Ken Fujii  
Martinez, CA

---

**From:** kstone6779@comcast.net [mailto:kstone6779@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 03, 2008 10:36 AM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Proposal 2-XA

MLPA Task Force,

I am 100% in favor of Proposal 2-XA. This achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA.

I am 100% against Proposal 4. This would close virtually all recreational fishing areas north of Point Conception and mean the virtual end of fishing out of San Francisco Bay.

Thank You,  
Ken Stone

---

From: sdaunell@svn.net [<mailto:sdaunell@svn.net>]  
Sent: Thursday, April 03, 2008 7:54 PM

To: MLPAComments  
Subject: support of option 2-XA

Dear BRTF

I am writing to urge you to support option 2-XA, I think that it is the only option that mets the goals of the mlpa and still leaves realistic fishing oppertunities to the small boat recreational angler. The small boat recreational angler needs to have close to port areas open in order to safley fish the ocean. Option #4 that I DO NOT SUPPORT will not leave ANY rockfish areas open out of the San Francisco Bay. Option #4 salmon trolling restrictions for rockcod by catch is absurd and can only be written by somebody that does not know anything about or have any real experance trolling. By the way I do think that salmon will rebound in time and understand recent season closures.

I also think that option 2-XA can realistly be enforced. Don't forget that most DFG busts start with CAL-Tip tips from recreational anglers. No recrtional anglers out fishing , no tips called in. Recrational anglers are very conservation minded and want to protect the recorces for future generations and think that that goal can be acheved through existing limits and seasons.

Please support option 2-XA

thank you,  
Larry Daunell

---

**From:** MARTIN KOHLBRY [mailto:martinkohlbry@sbcglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 03, 2008 5:40 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** MLPA Options

April 3, 2008

Folks ...

I've been fishing Golden gate waters since 1954 and can't bring myself to believe that the State of California would actually consider shutting down coastal rockfishing fishing for an extreme environmental excuse, as outlined in Proposal 4.

The solution, it seems to me, would be an intelligently such as that outlined in Proposal 2-XA. This well though-out approach is strong in both conservation and balance. Prop 4 would, quite honestly,

decimate a once thriving industry that is unlikely to survive the impact. The economic and personal disasters Prop 4 would cause are incalculable in their impact on commercial and recreational fishermen and suppliers, as well as the loss of tax and license fee revenues to the state.

At my age, I've more than my share of hours spent fishing our waters. Now it's time we all do some sensible to safeguard the resource and to preserve reasonable fishing opportunities for the next generation of coastal fishermen. We've been an integral part of the heritage of this great state. Please don't let it end here.

Thank you,

Martin Kohlbry, skipper  
F/V Fishtales  
Pillar Point Harbor

---

**From:** MARTIN KOHLBRY [mailto:martinkohlbry@sbcglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 03, 2008 9:36 AM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Disposition of the offshore salmon fishery

April 3, 2008

Folks ...

I've been fishing Golden gate waters for salmon since 1954 and can't bring myself to believe that the State of California would actually consider shutting down coastal salmon fishing for an extreme environmental excuse, as outlined in Proposal 4.

The short-term solution to provide salmon stocks time to regenerate seems intelligently outlined in Proposal 2-XA. This well thought-out approach is strong in both conservation and balance. Prop 4 would, quite honestly, decimate a once thriving industry that is unlikely to regenerate anywhere nearly as quickly as the salmon population. The economic and personal disasters Prop 4 would cause are incalculable in their impact on commercial and recreational fishermen and suppliers, as well as the loss of tax and license fee

revenues to the state.

At my age, I've more than my share of hours spent salmon fishing on coastal waters. Now it's time we all do something sensible to rebuild the resource and preserve fishing opportunities for the next generation of offshore fishermen. We've been part of the heritage of this great state. Please don't let it end here.

Thank you,

Martin Kohlbry, skipper  
F/V Fishtales  
Pillar Point Harbor

---

**From:** Matthew Plut [mailto:sw44magnum@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 03, 2008 2:19 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Please ASupport Proposal 2-XA

I am a recreational fisherman, diver and a member of Coastside Fishing Club.

I am writing to urge the members of the BRTF and the Fish and Game Commission to support Proposal 2-XA. This process will affect a significant portion of the coast and have a huge economic impact. The livelihoods of commercial fishermen, bait and tackle shops, harbors, travel lodges boat and trailer dealers, service centers associated with boat, trailer and automotive repair, are just some of the industries which will be affected by the implementation of the NCC MPA's.

The impacts of Proposal 2-XA, while substantial, will still allow businesses to survive with their implementation. Once again, I strongly urge you to support Proposal 2-XA.

Respectfully,

Matthew S. Plut

---

**From:** Michael [mailto:seacap26@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 03, 2008 9:11 AM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Proposal 2-XA

Dear BRTF,



Hello, my name is Michael Caporale and I want to submit this letter in support of proposal **2-XA**. I believe that 2-XA meets the conservation and scientific goals of the MLPA. Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal that maintains broad support among a multitude of fishing user groups. Finally, 2-XA creates a strong foundation of marine reserves in seven core areas with a State Marine Reserve serving as the spoke of the MPA wheel.

As a conservationist and fisherman, I believe that the waters off our coast need some level of protection. However, proposal 1-3 and proposal 4 are extreme in their attempt to protect our coastal waters. Proposal 2-XA is the most scientifically sound, balanced and fair proposal on the table. Please keep in mind that there are a broad number of constituents who support proposal 2-XA. Thank you for your time.

Respectfully,

Michael Caporale

---

From: fshmngr@aol.com [<mailto:fshmngr@aol.com>]  
Sent: Thursday, April 03, 2008 2:30 PM  
To: MLPAComments  
Subject: Proposal 2-XA

Blue Ribbon Task Force,

Please consider strongly approving Proposal 2-XA. This is the only proposal that will strike the important balance between use, conservation and preservation. To alter this proposal in any way will create a greater impact on fishermen and the community and businesses that revolve around the water.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,  
Michael Weinberg-Lynn  
President  
Osprey Seafood of CA, Inc.

---

**From:** Mike Giraudo [<mailto:mike@intecsolutions.com>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 03, 2008 11:13 PM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** 2-XA

I am very much in favor of 2-XA. This is the only proposal that has support of both fishermen and conservationists and thus the only logical choice. 2-XA meets the conservation objectives of the law while giving the coastal communities the best chance for survival.

Please choose 2-XA - there are whole communities and economies that are depending on it.

Mike Giraudo

Pacifica, CA

---

**From:** Mike Giraudo [mailto:mike@intecsolutions.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 03, 2008 6:42 AM  
**To:** MLPAComments; Mike Chrisman  
**Subject:** 2-XA

I am writing with my concerns for the MLPA. I support 2-XA because it contains the best chance for the fish.

- Proposal 2-XA has a strong backbone of marine reserves with seven core areas where a State Marine Reserve serves as the foundation of the MPA cluster.
- Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on total ecosystem protection with an emphasis on the "High" level of protection.
- Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on contributing to a network of MPAs in the "preferred" size range.

Please give your support to 2-XA

Mike Giraudo  
Pacifica, Ca

---

**From:** Nelson95758@aol.com [mailto:Nelson95758@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 03, 2008 11:53 AM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** MLPA proposals

My name is Nelson Loo. I'm a recreational fisherman and I support Prop. 2XA. I've only been saltwater fishing for a few years but I have seen a lot of changes to the rules and regulations in that short time. Changes that include smaller limits, shorter seasons and now possibly no season at all for salmon. Our ability to fish is being taken away a little at a time. I believe in conservation as long as it is based on good science. That's why I support 2XA. This proposal was put together with input from many user groups as well as scientist and fisherman who know the ocean. All user groups will have areas taken away but 2XA provides a good balance across the board while meeting or exceeding MLPA guidelines. After reviewing all the proposals I'm sure the right decision will be made. 2XA.

Thank you,  
Nelson Loo

---

**From:** oceanview [mailto:oceanview@solanowireless.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 03, 2008 10:10 PM  
**To:** Mike Chrisman; MLPAComments  
**Subject:** 2-XA

Hello, I would like to let you know that I am in support of proposal 2-XA. My son enjoys going fishing with his dad. If the coast is closed to fishing that would make my husband

have to go out to sea to an unsafe distance to fish. If that happens I will have no choice but to not let my son go. I can not allow to jeopardize his safety in that way. This would end a tradition of fishing in our family that has been in place for many generations. Please also understand that 2-XA will protect the marine life and is scientifically sound. Conservation is important but if it is to extreme it can have devastating repercussions in many ways. Again 2-XA is the right choice.

---

**From:** oceanview [mailto:oceanview@solanowireless.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 03, 2008 10:03 PM  
**To:** Mike Chrisman; MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Proposal 2-XA

To all concerned,

As a sport fisherman in California for many years I can not express how passionate I am about the only proposal that make any sense which is 2-XA.

To close the costal shores of California and not allow fishing would be a devastating decision. It would mandate people like myself to travel out to sea to an unsafe distance with my children just to catch a few fish and enjoy the day with my children doing so.

Proposal 2-XA meets the scientific and logical conservation choices that we actually could benefit from. Us being the marine life as well as citizens and fisherman of California. The other proposals are so extreme that they are not logical, nor would they produce any better conservation measures than 2-XA.

Please see the value of Proposal 2-XA in comparison to the others and help make the right choice for California.

Thank you

Mark Mathis and Family.

---

**From:** Jim N/A [mailto:helicon01@pacbell.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 03, 2008 10:00 AM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Cc:** Mike Chrisman  
**Subject:** A Kid in Love with Fishing

Hello,

My name is Patrick Pratt, I'm using my grandfather's computer to send this. I love being outdoors and it keep me out of trouble. I have been fishing more and more since my

Grandfather and Uncle took me on a charter boat out to the Farallon Islands to fish for rockfish. I caught my limit that day and have become hooked on fishing ever since.

Please do the right thing and pass proposal 2-XA so that I'm able to fish in the ocean without big areas being closed. My grandfather told me about the other proposals and it would take some of the better fishing areas away. Fishing has become a passion and I like spending the time with my grandfather. He has taught me the regulations and showed me different types of fishing.

Sincerely,  
Patrick Pratt  
Age 13

---

From: Robert Filbrun [<mailto:filbrunrl@sbcglobal.net>]  
Sent: Thursday, April 03, 2008 9:23 PM  
To: MLPAComments  
Subject: Support for Proposal 2-XA

To whom it may concern:

Members of the BRTF,

Please support Proposal 2-XA. I have heard opinions that state we need Proposal #4 to protect our ocean's habitat. This opinion has no basis in truth or science at all. Hook and line fishermen do not destroy the habitat. We only harvest a small percentage of the fish in the waters we are allowed to fish in. Rock fish are already protected outside of 120'. Sport fishing is not a threat to sustaining our ocean's resources for future generations. I know this is true because I can find columns of fish that reach from the surface to the bottom in many areas.

I my opinion Proposal #4 is not about good science it is about getting the fishermen off of the water.

Please allow us to continue to fish and protect the economy of the State of California by voting for Proposal 2-XA.

Thank you for allowing comments on the proposals.

Respectfully,

Robert Filbrun

---

**From:** ROGER A ARNAL [<mailto:rarnal@att.net>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 03, 2008 10:23 AM

**To:** MLPAComments

**Subject:** Please support proposal 2-XA

I am a 65-year old grandfather and lived in the Bay Area all my life. My late dad took me fishing for years starting in 1948. When he got older, I took him fishing. Now my son takes me and my grandson fishing.

Fishing is important to me and I spend tons of money doing it on from my boat, my son's boat, and my friend's boats.

Please accept my support for Proposal 2-XA. It's well balanced and has a broad support among many.

Thank you for reading this.

Sincerely,  
Roger Arnal  
Daly City, CA

---

**From:** s.beardsley [mailto:s.beardsley@comcast.net]

**Sent:** Thursday, April 03, 2008 6:59 PM

**To:** MLPAComments

**Subject:** Support Proposal 2-XA

To whom it may concern, I would like to ask for your support on MLPA Proposal 2-XA. There is a fundamental difference between a family enjoying a day's fishing and a commercial fishing crew fishing for profit. This point is often overlooked by those who advocate for no-fishing zones. Conservation organizations, angler groups, the sportfishing industry and others strongly support both conserving our fish and waters while protecting the public's right to access all areas along our nation's coastlines and to enjoy the sport of fishing. These two concepts are compatible. So please support Proposal 2-XA.

Sincerely

Scott Beardsley

---

**From:** Tad Houston [mailto:[tadhouston@hotmail.com](mailto:tadhouston@hotmail.com)]

**Sent:** Thursday, April 03, 2008 9:24 AM

**To:** MLPAComments

**Subject:** 2-XA please

Please note that i support proposal 2-XA as a balanced plan to protect our natural resources while also protecting or local economy.

Thank You,  
Tad Houston

---

**From:** oceanview [mailto:oceanview@solanowireless.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 03, 2008 10:12 PM  
**To:** Mike Chrisman; MLPAComments  
**Subject:** Re: 2-XA

Hello, I would like to let you know that I am in support of proposal 2-XA. My son enjoys going fishing with his dad. If the coast is closed to fishing that would make my husband have to go out to sea to an unsafe distance to fish. If that happens I will have no choice but to not let my son go. I can not allow to jeopardize his safety in that way. This would end a tradition of fishing in our family that has been in place for many generations. Please also understand that 2-XA will protect the marine life and is scientifically sound. Conservation is important but if it is to extreme it can have devastating repercussions in many ways. Again 2-XA is the right choice.

Toni Cellucci

---

**PASSALACQUA & PASSALACQUA, LLP**  
**ATTORNEYS AT LAW**

152 PIPER STREET  
POST OFFICE BOX 903  
HEALDSBURG, CALIFORNIA 95448

RICHARD J. PASSALACQUA  
JOSEPH R. PASSALACQUA

-----  
(707) 433-7255  
FAX (707) 433-3426

EMIL R. PASSALACQUA  
(1931-1995)

April 7, 2008

Mr. A. Richardson  
P.O. Box 40  
Stewarts Point, CA 95480

Re: MLPA BLUE RIBBON TASK FORCE REVIEW  
ON APRIL 22-23, 2008

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing this letter in advance of the above-referenced meeting in the hopes that you will give great consideration to "PROPOSAL 2XA", and make that your choice in what amounts to a very difficult decision.

I understand that this has not been an easy process, as there are many interest groups that have weighed in to give input as to what areas of public and private land should be protected areas. As a sport fisherman, I too want to protect our local waters. I believe whole-heartedly that "PROPOSAL 2XA" helps us achieve that. It meets the policy guidelines of the MLPA, and that is because it is a proposal that was worked on for many hours by a vast assortment of people who support the MLPA. These are people who are knowledgeable about our coastline and know what it takes to ensure that this beautiful area is protected overtime.

In my review of the other two proposals that are being considered, it simply does not appear that they mesh with the policies of the MLPA as well as "PROPOSAL 2XA". Those two proposals were drafted by environmentalists who are on salary and therefore have their own agenda, which does not take into consideration the local economy of those who live along the coastal region and the ecosystems that are so important to all of us.

Finally, "PROPOSAL 2XA" provides an equal burden on the protected areas for both public and private lands. It will preserve two of the eight public access points at The Sea Ranch, whereas the other proposals do not preserve any. Also, it is endorsed by many local residents and business owners on the coast because it is sensitive to the environment, adjacent landowners, and the local commercial industry.

I am confident that when the final decision is made, you will agree that "PROPOSAL 2XA" is the one that truly fits with the guidelines and policies of the North Coast MLPA. Thank you for the time and attention that you have given to this letter and my support of "PROPOSAL 2XA".

Sincerely,

JOSEPH R. PASSALACQUA

JRP/rg

I am a third generation Californian from a family of 12 (yes, the number is 12) children. As you can imagine, money was a bit scarce growing up. What we could afford usually involved trips camping and fishing in California; from the beaches to the mountain lakes and streams. My parents, as well as most of my siblings, still live in California and enjoy outdoor pursuits. You could say that we have our own little family multiplier as it pertains to our expenditures on recreation in this state. There are now 21 grandchildren (surely more will follow) who are being taught their parent's love of fishing, hunting, camping, etc.

We would all respectfully suggest that you **STRONGLY** consider implementing MLPA proposal 2-XA. This proposal seems to be the only proposal which acknowledges the socio-economic impacts of the reserves you are establishing. It is the most balanced proposal, and certainly the only proposal which attempts to fairly provide recreational access to folks like my family and future generations. In addition, it is the only proposal which preserves access to cherished areas near the safety of harbors, a necessity when the afternoon wind starts to blow.

This process should be implementing the wishes of the people of California, not special interest groups which want to remove us from the water.

Thank you for considering our feedback.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Bill Dutra".

Bill Dutra  
Sr. Vice President  
Owens Financial Group, Inc.  
2221 Olympic Blvd.  
Walnut Creek, CA 94595